

New-York Daily Tribune

FRIDAY, AUGUST 7, 1863.

NEWS OF THE DAY.

THE WAR.

—Dispatches from Memphis of the 5th represent that everything is quiet on the river below. Col. Hatch reports that Forrest, Biddle and Wilson are retreating, with their forces entirely broken up, and their men deserting in every direction. Col. Hatch has divided his force, and is securing the country, picking up all the small squads he can find. A scout who left Meriden on the 1st, and Okaloosa on the 2d, reports that Gen. Joe Johnston's army is at Enterprise and Brandon, under the direct command of Gen. Hardee. Most of the Rebel force at the former place were ready to move at a moment's notice.

—John Merryman of Baltimore County, Md., who took a leading part in the violent opposition made by secession sympathizers in Maryland to the passage of the national troops from the East to Washington City, just after the war commenced, has been presented by the Grand Jury of the United States District Court in Baltimore for treason. He gave bail on Friday, July 31, in the sum of \$10,000 to answer the charge at the next November term of the court.

—Letters from Vicksburg bring the gratifying intelligence that Gen. Osterhaus, whose death the Rebels reported, is still among the living, and, though wounded, he is yet as able to serve the Union as ever. He has had the privilege of reading his own obituary, and may well be proud of the record which he has made.

—There were 20 women and several children killed in Vicksburg during the siege. Their blood is on the hands of Pemberton, who refused to permit them to leave the city.

GENERAL NEWS.

—The Maine Democratic Convention has again put Bion Bradbury on the course for Governor. The resolutions of the Convention are very coppery, opposing everything the Government has done, proposing to do, or can do. Bradbury contributes a private letter in which he says madmen rule the hour—the Republic can only be saved by the union of all conservative men to put down fanaticism; he is opposed to emancipating negroes, opposed to confiscating John B. Floyd's stolen property, opposed to military authority, opposed to the draft, and opposed to being beaten for Governor.

—The Republican State Committee of Massachusetts met in Boston on Friday, and voted to issue a call inviting "the Republicans of Massachusetts and all others who stand by the Government in crushing a thoroughly wicked Rebellion, which has for its aim and object the overthrow of Republican institutions, and the extension and perpetuation of human slavery," to meet in convention at Worcester, on Thursday, the 24th day of September next, to nominate candidates for State officers, &c.

—The Teachers' National Convention met in Chicago on Thursday. The attendance from different parts of the country is large, fully 1,500 teachers being present, three-fourths of whom are females. A large number are from New-England. The present occasion promises to be one of much interest to the friends of education.

—The Temperance Convention in behalf of temperance in the army and navy, held at Saratoga Springs on Wednesday, Aug. 5, was a success. The Rev. Dr. Newell of New-York was President. Many important resolutions were discussed and adopted, and in three successive meetings several spirited addresses were made.

—The Union State Convention of Pennsylvania completed their ticket by nominating the Hon. Daniel Agnew of Beaver County for Supreme Judge.

—Mr. H. L. Palmer of Milwaukee has been nominated for Governor of Wisconsin by the Democratic State Convention.

On the second page this morning we give Literary Reviews and Items, Poetry, a letter from the Cherokee Nation, &c. On the third page, much matter about the Draft, some foreign documents, various communications, and items. Agricultural and Local affairs occupy the seventh page.

There was a general and proper observance of the Day of Thanksgiving and Prayer yesterday in this and the neighboring cities, and, indeed, through all the loyal country. Here business was mostly suspended, stores closed, and the people made a holiday at home, at church, or on excursions, as tastes dictated. The day was hot, but a smart thunder-shower at noon cooled the air a little, and made outdoor endurance quite tolerable. There was a general expression of satisfaction on the public face, and every outward appearance gave token of the best of feeling. Even Copperheads refrained from howling about Black Republican tyranny, and put on the guise of quiet, loyal citizens. We do not learn that any violence or accidents marred the comely order of the day; on the contrary New-York was, for a wonder, peaceful if not exactly pious. In other columns our reporters sketch the events of the day, and make notes of several appropriate sermons.

SEYMOUR AND THE DRAFT.

The Daily News, according to the Express's threat that the Draft shall not be made in our City under existing circumstances, says:

"Gov. Seymour has pledged his sacred word and honor, and the people of New-York trust in him and believe him, that not one single drafted citizen shall be forced away from the State until the constitutionality of the Conscription Act shall have been decided on by our Courts. He is virtually pledged, as do as The Express says: to call forth the entire militia force of New-York, to resist the kidnapping, which Abolitionists would tell us is inevitable, and we entertain no doubt that he will keep his word."

—That Seymour is at heart with J. F. Davis and his crew, we have no manner of doubt. We believe it is susceptible of proof that he has ennobled the Confederate Constitution as decidedly superior to that of the United States, and that he has expressed a strong desire that New-York should adopt that Constitution and thus become part and parcel of the man-stealer's Confederacy. But where and when did he "pledge his sacred word and honor" that the enforcement of the National Conscription Act shall be postponed "until its constitutionality shall have been decided on by our [State] Courts?" When was the principle established that an act of Congress shall have no practical validity until State Courts affirm its constitutionality? This is a new way of settling constitutional questions—to presume a Federal law invalid until State Courts see fit to approve and affirm it. On behalf of the loyal millions of our State, who do not desire nor design

that the Rebellion shall have time afforded it to recover from the stunning blows it has recently received, we call for the evidence on which The News asserts that "Gov. Seymour has pledged his sacred word and honor" to the Copperhead Rebellion proposed. To whom was this pledge made? What were its precise terms? Mr. Ben. Wood is a Member of Congress, past and future, and has been an open, manly ally of the Slaveholding Rebels from the start. He has not hitherto walked in darkness and worned his way upward so spirally as the demit-semi-Rebels of the Seymour pattern. He now tells us that "Seymour has pledged his sacred word and honor" to these Draft-resisters, and we demand to know where and how he made that traitorous compact. Will The News explain?

IS IT PREJUDICE?

If to any it seems dogmatic to deny that there is any such general repugnance to the vicinity of negroes as is implied in their exclusion from public conveyances, we beg leave to remind him that we rest entirely on facts, and on facts supplied by the daily walk of our antagonists. Our position is not that we feel no such aversion to the presence of negroes as they assert, but that they feel none, and to sustain this position we cite them as our chief witnesses. Consider the following:

1. In the horse-cars of our city, colored persons have usually been permitted to ride as passengers, though there have been cases of their total or partial exclusion. Now, who ever heard of a white person who chose to walk two miles rather than ride in the same car with a negro or negroes? We, certainly, know no instance of the kind. Why is not this a fair test, and conclusive?

2. On one of our City Railroads, if not more, cars have been run alternately labeled, "Colored persons allowed to ride in this car," and "Colored persons not allowed to ride in this car;" so that each fastidious white could gratify his "prejudice" by simply waiting two or three minutes for a car of the "not" variety. Now, it is possible that twenty persons have, at one time or another, allowed a car to pass that would have taken them on their way, because blacks were allowed to ride in it, and quietly waited for a successor that admitted no passengers other than those of Caucasian hue and features. But that this has not been usual with white persons—that nine hundred and ninety-nine of every thousand whites who patronize the lines making this discrimination have habitually taken the first car that came along, in utter indifference to the staring announcement that colored persons were not permitted to ride therein—we do know, and call all our fellow-passengers in these cars to witness. Is not this testimony in point?

3. There are, and for at least thirty years have been, first-class hotels in our city that employ colored waiters, with perhaps an equal number that prefer white ones. Every intelligent traveler knows this—knows that, by patronizing one of the former class, he necessarily exposes himself to hourly proximity to negroes, which in the other case he wholly avoids. Now, how many of the last million persons who have put up at one or another of these hotels, have styled one of these classes of waiters and preferred the other on purpose to escape the vicinity or the odor of negroes? Will you say one in fifty? Or a hundred? Or five hundred? We are confident that not one in ten thousand has preferred one hotel to another simply because it had white servants instead of black. Yet why not, if the "innate prejudice" theory is well founded?

4. In fact, our negro-prescribing correspondent settled the whole question against himself in his unconscious narration of his wife's flinging and flouting at the suggestion of "a negro Member of Congress" profaning her carpets by his tread. A negro boot-black, fire-maker, carriage-driver, cook, chambermaid, &c., &c., might step thereon any day without shocking her sensibilities: it is only his appearance in a character evincing eminence and social consideration that she could not abide. Yet why should a negro Congressman more revolt the Anglo-Saxon eye or nose than a negro stable-boy?

The solemn truth is that this proscription and soul-brooding abuse of an unfortunate race has just two impulses—1. Slavery, with the parasitical desire on the part of our Northern flunkies, especially of the commercial genus, to pander to the pride and gratify the humor of the slaveholding caste; 2. Aristocracy, or that domineering spirit which impels every base creature to seek to plant his foot on somebody's neck. The slaveholder would feel rebuked and shamed if he saw such a woman as he is accustomed to strip and flog, to drive to the cotton-field so soon as her babe is three weeks old, and to treat every way as a brute, treated here as our fellow-being. It deadens the sting of his conscience to see negroes hunted by mobs and rudely thrust out of public conveyances in Northern cities; and he says to himself, "True, I make them work for me for nothing; but I don't treat them with wanton, aimless brutality, like that. Niggers fare worse at the North than at the South." So he stifles the sharp twinges of his inward monitor, pays some base priest twenty dollars for a sermon on Ham, Canaan, &c., &c., and goes on the bad, old way.

As to the "prejudice," so called, it is manifest that it grows stronger as you descend the social ladder. Sir Philip Sidney, Humboldt, Channing, would scarcely feel and never betray it; while a dirty, drunken ruffian, who has nothing on earth to boast of but a skin by courtesy termed white, fairly boils over with loathing of "niggers." With his frothy froth reeking with tobacco-smith and his breath utterly rotten with champagne whisky, he will tell you that the odor of niggers is unbearable, and he must quit the car if one is allowed to enter it. Which makes you wish that one would.

For our own part, we aim to treat all human beings according to their essential merits, regardless of superficial distinctions. If one is filthy or vile—as many of all colors are—he should be restrained from inflicting his presence on decent people, whether in cars or elsewhere; but let none be insulted, humiliated, or

deprived of any common right, because of anything so involuntary and irrespective of moral or intellectual qualities as his color.

THE FUTURE OF SLAVERY.

How Slavery is to be necessarily affected by the progress and termination of our Civil War, is a question which we do not at present see fit to debate; but the kindred problem of the possibility of setting this grim Dragon again firmly upon his pedestal, is discussed by other journals in such manner as to call for comment.

"W. L. B." in The World argues that "There are cogent reasons for saying that the labor system of the South, as it has heretofore existed, is an impossibility in the future, for a period so limited as to make it useless to attempt its restoration."

—We certainly hope this is true, though not for the reasons assigned by "W. L. B." He holds that, since the invention of the Cotton Gin, an irresistible tendency to concentration has developed itself—the working of slaves in large gangs on spacious plantations having been proved far more profitable than the old system, under which nearly every white family had its two or three negroes employed in the labor of the farm or the household. Thus, while slaves increase, slaveholders do not; the market value of slaves rises; only the rich can buy or afford to hold them; the great mass of the whites experience the evils of the system without its benefits; they naturally grow impatient and dissatisfied; so that Slavery must have speedily been overthrown, had no rebellion been fomented; and, having been terribly shaken and shattered by the Union War, it will hardly be possible to reestablish it in any case, and utterly impracticable to perpetuate it, utterly irrespective of all philanthropic or ethical considerations.

So far "W. L. B." Let us briefly indicate his miscalculations:

I. That every wrong is unprofitable, we all know; but to whom? No one doubts that gambling, for example, is a fearful evil; few doubt that it ought to be, so far as possible, suppressed by law; but he who should therefore expect the gamblers to move for or unite in its suppression would grievously mistake. Never on earth was a social evil suppressed by the unprompted volition of the class on which it conferred consequence, wealth and power. The current babble of the North "selling its slaves to the South, and then abolishing Slavery," is as false as falsehood can be. The slaveholders of Rhode Island, the slaveholders of New-York, as a class, resisted stoutly the overthrow of their "institution;" had the matter been left to their choice, they would have been slave-trading and slaveholding to this day. "Fanatics" hunted them out of their dear, old ways, and were as hoarsely cursed for it as their successors are at this hour.

II. The relative number of the slaveholders may be diminished without all reducing the power of the class. For instance: Here is one of the Sea Islands down the Southern coast, with a total population of some Two or Three Thousand, whereof but three are registered slaveholders. Here, Slavery, according to "W. L. B.," is a pyramid on its apex, and must soon topple over. But look more closely, and you discern your mistake. Of that population, two-thirds are slaves—benighted, imbruted, cowed, timorous—of no more account politically than dogs of hounds. Then there is a lawyer, a doctor, a priest, one or two merchants, perhaps a white wheelwright or blacksmith, a miller, &c., with their respective families—all basking in the smiles of the three great planters, living by their patronage, obsequious to their wishes. You see that those three planters wield all the power there is on that island—take turns in going to the Legislature, or send the lawyer as their mere tool—so that Slavery is actually stronger there, save against an armed raid or black insurrection, than if there were a hundred slaveholders instead of barely three.

III. The economies of concentration do not extend to slave-breeding. Slaves are cheapest grown on small farms, in a hilly, healthy country like upland Virginia; and for those so grown there is a constant demand to stock Cotton and Sugar plantations in the more fertile but sickly South-West. It was the slave-breeding interest, with its horrid array of negro-traders, auctioneers, jailors, &c., &c., that gave Virginia to the Rebellion. Will it be easy to convince these breeders—too generally indolent and profligate—that they may better grow corn by their own labor than have a family of negroes to produce their food, with a "boy" to sell every few years for twelve to fifteen hundred dollars? We doubt it.

We have heard of evils that "cured themselves," and, in the long run, this is probably so. All wrong is suicidal—contains the germs of its own overthrow. But slaveholders, as a class, will never abolish Slavery while they can grow negroes at an imperceptible cost and sell them at sixteen for a thousand dollars or over; and if Slavery shall emerge from this War not materially crippled, we deem it quite likely to live through several generations more. Admit that it is shaken and shattered—with the guarantees of the Union and the active support of the Democratic party, its influence may be even greater for its obvious peril. We cannot doubt that the true interest of North and South alike require that Slavery should die utterly and die forthwith.

A GOOD RECORD.

We do not know Col. THOMAS E. BRAMLETTE, the Governor elect of Kentucky, but we note with pleasure that his election was aided by the vote of no traitor and is received by the Copperheads with general and intense disgust. The following certificate of merit, given by The St. Louis Republican, is eagerly copied into The World and kindred journals:

"Thomas E. Bramlette, the Abolition candidate for Governor of Kentucky, who, under hostile proclamation of martial law, and the office of his military superiors, throughout the State, is the only gubernatorial candidate that can be voted for there to-day's election, is, literally, an 'invulnerable officer.' Just before the war commenced, he was a candidate for Congress, then held the office of Commonwealth's Attorney in the Greenback circuit, and, upon a short tenure, became Circuit Judge. He then ran for Judge of the Court of Appeals, but his constituents signified with marked emphasis at the polls their desire that he should not occupy the office. Next he became Colonel, U. S. A., and was appointed to the position of Brigadier-General. Although two of his appointments are of a military character, he has never been in active service. Now he becomes Governor of Kentucky for any number of years, and is to be known as 'Savior of Kentucky to Freedom.'"

—The Republican is bitter, but does not

venture to charge him with dishonesty or with Rebel sympathies; so we can't help thinking he is the right man for the place. The pretense that no one else could be voted for is upset by the notorious facts that the Hon. Charles A. Wickliffe (John Tyler's second Postmaster-General and a Representative in the last Congress) was an opposing candidate, receiving thousands of votes in the State and a majority in several counties. Any Kentuckian, who is a loyal citizen of the United States, could vote as freely against Bramlette as for him; but notorious and active Rebels are disfranchised by a State law, which Gen. Burnside upheld and sought to have generally enforced. Of course, this annoys The World, which would gladly have had Wickliffe elected by the votes of open sympathizers with the Slaveholders' Rebellion, as Seymour was. That, however, was not to be; and, indeed, it seems most unreasonable that those who have already a "Provisional Government" somewhere off in the South with the debris of Bragg's army, with a full delegation in the Rebel Congress at Richmond, should claim or even wish to vote for a Union Governor and Members of a Union Congress. One Government at a time is enough for any man. At all events, Col. Bramlette is the Union Governor elect, with a four-years' term before him; and those who don't like the choice are at liberty to grumble to their heart's content.

THE SITUATION.

There is a lull in military operations all over the territory on which the storm of war spent its strength last month. Charleston is the only exception. Efforts for the reduction of Fort Sumter are still vigorously pressed. Reinforcements have been sent to Gen. Gillmore—if public statements to that effect may be trusted—and also to the Rebel commander. Artillery within easy range of Sumter are nearly ready to open; and though the repulse at Fort Wagner seems to be accepted as decisive, so far as that particular work is concerned, it by no means involves giving over the attempt against Sumter. The siege of that goes steadily on. But in Tennessee and in Virginia, the great armies of Rosecrans and Meade are either idle, or taking what the President calls "a good ready" for the next start. The same may be said, with certain limitations, of the forces under Gen. Grant. In the capture of Vicksburg, moreover, their campaign reached its natural and final result.

But neither Rosecrans nor Meade can be said to have ended their work. The former has indeed driven Bragg from his chosen line in front of Murfreesboro, and by a succession of maneuvers, which were too well planned to admit of much fighting, compelled him to fall back to Chattanooga. In a strictly military sense, that may have terminated one campaign, but it is not such a positive, complete, fruitful success as to meet the popular expectation, nor, we suppose, to fulfill the purposes of the Government. Chattanooga is still, as it has been hitherto, an objective point strategically essential to the control of the Rebel communications, and not less important for the long-delayed liberation of East Tennessee, if that campaign is to be undertaken from Tullahoma as a base. And this is why the accounts from Gen. Rosecrans are so irreconcilable on the face of them. He is an ambitious, enterprising, and capable commander, willing to do his work with very moderate means. He has a large army and two campaigns before him, but neither progresses. The situation recalls his long delay at Murfreesboro, and before that at Nashville, each followed by an impetuous advance, which was soon arrested. It can do no harm to say now that in both the former instances Gen. Rosecrans found it nearly impossible to preserve his communications, and that he was compelled to delay till sufficient stores could be accumulated, first at Nashville and then at Murfreesboro, to render him for the time independent of other resources. The great deficiency in his army was of cavalry—the only arm which over a country so extensive could keep open connections with Louisville. Until the recent expedition of Morgan came to a disastrous end, there has been no time when the road between Louisville and Nashville was perfectly secure. The present hesitation, therefore, in Gen. Rosecrans's advance, is not to be regarded as an abandonment of either campaign. Bragg's army, though depleted in order to strengthen both Johnston and Lee, is still strong enough to hold Chattanooga against anything but the whole of the force under Gen. Rosecrans, and the whole of that force cannot advance while it is dependent on Nashville or even Murfreesboro for supplies, and while it is not augmented with cavalry enough to protect its rear.

Its actual condition in this respect is a matter of notoriety in the Rebel army, and is counted on for the present possession of Chattanooga.

Still less can Gen. Meade be said to have finished a campaign—unless it be the Rebel campaign in Pennsylvania. The escape of Lee across the Potomac threw upon Gen. Meade the necessity of taking the initiative; of remodeling the whole campaign; above all things, of so ordering matters that he should not find himself North of the Rappahannock with Lee once more behind the intrenchments of Fredericksburg—a position which, excepting always the Peninsula, is the most awkward in Virginia for the National forces. The line of Fredericksburg, considered with reference to an advance upon Richmond, is a good one in many respects, but its advantages are all dependent upon the occupation of the South side of the Rappahannock, not of the North. Whether by the ordering of Gen. Meade or by the choice of Lee does not clearly appear, but it does appear that the Rebel force holds at present what is known as the Gordonsville line, having that point as a base, and stretching Northwardly to Orange Court House and Culpepper. If now General Meade intends to make a waiting campaign during the Summer, he has to keep his forces so disposed as to render another movement into the Shenandoah valley impracticable, while at the same time he protects his left flank against the even more perilous maneuver

which was attempted last Summer against Gen. Pope, and which drove him in hurried retreat beneath the defenses of Washington. It may be urged that Lee is not likely to enter again upon an aggressive campaign till his army has had time to recover from the shock of its defeat at Gettysburg, and the demoralization incident to its retreat; but the answer is, first, that Gen. Meade is bound to presume that his enemy means mischief at all times, and to provide against it; and, secondly, that the prestige of Gettysburg is in a measure counterbalanced by the successful retreat across the Potomac. More important than either consideration is the possibility of such a concentration of forces by the Rebels in Virginia as shall practically abandon the Western and Southern defensive campaigns, in order to stake the fortunes of the Confederacy upon the event of one grand movement in Virginia.

The Rebels are in exactly the position in which such an effort is probable. Their army under Johnston is so weak that, unless behind the defenses of Mobile, it will not dream of giving battle to Gen. Grant. Their army under Bragg is stronger, but still is inspired with no hope of an ultimately successful resistance to Rosecrans's advance. If those armies are left to struggle separately, each will be destroyed. If they are united, they might delay the progress of either Rosecrans or Grant, but the other would be left unopposed, and the unopposed operations of either would soon render the success of the other equally certain. There remains, therefore, no hope to the Rebel leaders but in one concentrated effort in Virginia. The South-West is lost beyond redemption, but its loss might be balanced by an overwhelming victory in the east. Moreover, it has always been the policy of the Rebels to abandon points so soon as they became indefensible, and to unite their forces where success was possible.

We regard it therefore as not improbable that the first aggressive movement will be made, not by Gen. Meade, but by Lee. If the former is to begin, he has only to push straight upon Culpepper, and may be sure of a battle on one side or the other of the Rapidan. But the granting of furloughs, and other indications from the Army of the Potomac, are not in favor of such a probability. It seems to be considered that Lee has had his own way about emerging from the Shenandoah, and is established on ground from which he cannot be driven by anything like equal forces. We have therefore to wait either for him to move, or for such an increase of Gen. Meade's force as shall seem to him to make offensive movements possible. The campaign may be halting, but it may rather be said not to have begun than to be finished.

THE BOOTH CASE.

We rejoice briefly and finally to the second effort of a Copperhead cotemporary to nullify the decision of the United States Supreme Court in *Abraham v. Booth*. The greater part of the two columns devoted to that attempt is consumed in a restatement of the argument which we have already conclusively answered. But take this specimen of an endeavor to pervert and wrench from its fair meaning the ready consent we gave to try the question on its merits, and to judge the opinion of the Court by the facts:

"Whether the decision of the Court was with reference to the fact that Booth was arrested on the warrant of a United States Commissioner, or to the mode of taking him into custody, that fact is in the case. But Tanham has not denied that Booth was in the custody of the Marshal, under a warrant issued by a United States Commissioner, when discharged on habeas corpus by a State Judge, nor will it make much difference. Hence it follows, as the inevitable consequence of Tanham's first admission, that the decision of the Court was with reference to the fact that Booth was arrested on the warrant of a United States Commissioner, and therefore it can have no application whatever to a case in which that feature, viz: arrest on process, does not enter."

We admitted that if the decision of the Court was with reference to the fact of Booth's arrest on the warrant of a United States Commissioner, and was based on that ground—that is, upon the fact of his arrest on a warrant merely—it would not cover cases under the Conscription Act, where the arrest was not on such a warrant. Mark how this fair admission is, in the first place, distorted into a very different admission, which we did not make, and then how it is reasoned upon. The argument is this: that in order to discover whether the decision of the Court was with reference to a certain fact, it is only necessary to find that fact in the case, and that, being in the case, the decision of the Court must be in reference to it, and based upon it. Well, we find in the case this other fact, that Booth was a citizen of Milwaukee. "Hence it follows," according to the logic of this ingenious reasoner, "as the inevitable consequence" of this "admission," that "the decision of the Court was with reference to the fact that Booth was a citizen of Milwaukee; and therefore it (the decision) can have no application whatever to a case in which that feature, viz: citizenship of Milwaukee, does not enter." If this is manifestly absurd, it is not one whit more absurd than the argument to which it is a parallel. Again:

"The Tanham's argument is that the decision denied to the State Court the right to inquire, on habeas corpus, into the legality of Booth's imprisonment—not because he was held under judicial process, whether warrant of the County or judgment of the District Court, but on the ground that the General Government, being supreme within the sphere of action assigned to it, any power which it might assume to exercise, whether rightfully or not, were beyond the control of a State Court. In other words, that the State Court had no right to examine whether the General Government had gone beyond the sphere of action appropriated to it, because it was supreme within that sphere of action."

"The absurdity of this construction is too apparent to require comment."

The "absurdity" is not in "THE TRIBUNE'S" argument, but in the above dishonest statement of it. Why not have quoted what we did say? Here are the words:

"Now it is plain, and is repeatedly declared by the Judge, that he denies to the State Court the right to release Booth on habeas corpus, or to have him brought before them, not because he is held under judicial process, whether warrant of the Commissioner or judgment of the District Court; but because the authority of the United States by whomsoever exercised, is supreme, and not to be inquired into by a State Court on any pretence."

But further, Judge Taney does explicitly

affirm, in words which we have thrice before quoted, and of which this disputant could not have been ignorant, that if an arrest is made under color of United States authority, it is not for the State, but for the United States Courts, to investigate the validity of the arrest. This is his language:

"But after the return is made, and the State Judge or Court judicially apprised that the party is in custody UNDER THE AUTHORITY OF THE UNITED STATES, they can proceed as further. They THEN know that the prisoner is within the dominion and jurisdiction of another Government, and that neither the writ of habeas corpus nor any other process issued under State authority can pass over the line of division between the two sovereignties. He is then within the dominion and EXCLUSIVE jurisdiction of the United States. If he has committed an offense against their laws, their tribunals alone can punish him. If he is wrongfully imprisoned, THEIR judicial tribunals can release him and afford him redress."

Whatever "absurdity," therefore, is discoverable in the doctrine we have urged, is chargeable upon the Supreme Court of the United States as its author—not upon us. We waste space in exposing the fallacies and shifts by which these opponents of the Conscription and enemies of the Republic seek to confuse the clear purport of this case. The Courts and the People well understand that it covers the cases of arrest by Provost-Marshal, and that the effort to bring State and National forces into conflict by State writs of habeas corpus is defeated. It is sheerest folly for the baffled conspirators to persist in parading the details of their plot, when they know that its execution is become impossible.

FEDERAL DESPOTISM.

As there are many people who do not seem to realize how horribly oppressed and abused our people are by the "Military Despotism" now dominant in this country, we give what is esteemed a very flagrant example. The World says:

"THE ADMINISTRATION OATH.—The following is a correct copy of the oath required of all citizens who may find it necessary to obtain passes in Baltimore or elsewhere within Gen. Rosecrans's military jurisdiction. The same form would probably be imposed in the event of military law being established in this city:

"I do solemnly swear that I will support, protect, and defend the Constitution and Government of the United States against all enemies, whether domestic or foreign; and that I will bear true faith, allegiance, and loyalty to the same, in domestic, foreign, or civil war, or in any State Convention or Legislature to the contrary notwithstanding; and further, that I do this with a full determination, pledge, and purpose, without any reservation or excuse, to resist, withstand, and oppose, that I will well and faithfully perform on the duties which may be required of me—to help me God!"

—Is it not appalling? Just think of having "military law" established in this city, so that people who want to go and come on suspicious errands should be compelled to take such a blood-curdling oath as that!

Just hear The World expatiate on its enormities:

"To the general tenor of this oath, fairly and honestly interpreted, under an Administration which respected the Constitution the spirit in which it was established by the fathers, there might be no serious objection. But the practical and popular interpretation of it is that all who take it bind themselves in the most solemn manner to support and obey all the acts and military laws which the present Administration of the Government may see fit to enforce. In common parlance, this oath is considered a 'test of loyalty,' and no man in Maryland or Kentucky is allowed to vote who may be considered 'disloyal,' or, in other words, who is not known to be either a supporter of the Administration measures, or to be willing to submit to them in silence."

"The oath, in short, belongs to the policy of the leaders of the Republican party, which is to subvert the forms of our Government, making all State Rights, State interests, and State laws utterly subservient to the General Government, and precluding the very discussion of any terms of peace or readmission of the Southern States into the Union short of the 'Emancipation policy.'"

—We have thus given The World's objections

to this oath, and the whole of them. We do not care to expose their sophistry or their glaring assumptions. We simply ask a verdict as between the so-called tyranny that exacts such an oath and the highly questionable loyalty that revolts at it.

THE DOWNFALL OF THE MEXICAN REPUBLIC.

Our comment on the progress of events in Mexico has hitherto been based on the conflicting accounts derived from French and Mexican sources. Hereafter it will be otherwise. The papers which are published outside of the French lines will rarely get abroad; and, if they do, they will be so much later than the accounts furnished from Vera Cruz and the City of Mexico that they will only serve, in some instances, to correct inaccuracies of the French accounts, but rarely, if ever, to give us fresh items of news. It is obvious that, being thus deprived of the opportunity to hear, in important cases, the other side of the question, we have to be more cautious than ever to discriminate between facts and rumors.

We are prepared to see the French overjoyed and over-anguine as to the complete realization of the schemes of the Emperor. The accounts given by Gen. Forey himself and other French officers in the French papers, represent the enthusiasm of the Mexicans on their entering the City of Mexico, as exceeding the boldest expectation. "The entire population of this capital," says Gen. Forey in his official dispatch, "has welcomed the army with an enthusiasm bordering upon delirium. This population is eager for order, justice and true liberty." Gen. Forey promises to give on early occasion "fuller details respecting their reception, unequalled in history, which bears the character of a political event, the fame of which will be immense." The report of Gen. Forey does not quite agree with that given by a correspondent of The London Times, who was a witness of the General's reception, and who says:

"His reception could scarcely be said to be enthusiastic still; triumphal arches were erected, flowers were showered down upon him, balconies were filled with ladies, and the whole of the population seemed to have turned out, if for other purpose, at all events to gratify their curiosity."

The Cities of Mexico and Puebla have always been known as strongholds of the Conservative or Church party, and if the demonstrations in these cities had been all that the French represent them, it would not more prove a change of public opinion in the Republic than Copperhead demonstrations in the City of New-York or in Berks County would prove that the people of the Northern States were in favor of a recognition of the Southern Confederacy.

Nor can we attach much greater importance